DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 185 HE 008 850

AUTHOR Bertelsen, C. David
TITLE The Student at Youngstown State University: Attitudes and Opinions, 1976-77.
INSTITUTION Youngstown State Univ., Ohio.
PUB DATE Apr 77
NOTE 50p.
AVAILABLE FROM Student Affairs Division, Youngstown State University, Youngstown, Ohio 44503

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Commuting Students; Demography; Educational Quality; *Higher Education; Nonresidential Schools; *Questionnaires; School Surveys; *Student Attitudes; Student Interests; Student Needs; *Student Opinion; *Student Participation; Student Personnel Programs; Student Problems; Students; Student Transportation; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS Youngstown State University OH

ABSTRACT

Youngstown State University is a predominantly commuter campus. A six-page questionnaire was sent to a random sample of 2,000 students in the fall 1976 focusing on attitudes and opinions concerning commuting and associated problems, activities, and student services. Specific areas surveyed include demographic data; general university programs, including advisement, safety, clerical assistance, quality of education, satisfaction with the university, and most important problem facing YSU students; participation in activities, including frequency of participation, reasons for nonparticipation, specific interests, and student government; communications; commuting specifics, such as time on campus, mode of transportation, and convenience of library hours and scheduling problems; and student services. The analysis reveals that most students had positive perceptions of the quality of education, participated in at least one extracurricular activity per quarter, and spent at least one to five nonclass hours on campus. Demographic variables had little or no effect on the responses to the questions in the study. (JMF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED138185

THE STUDENT AT YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY: ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS, 1976-77

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

C. David Bertelsen
Student Affairs Division
Youngstown State University
April, 1977

HE008250

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. PROCEDURE.....2

Sample Selection.....2
The Questionnaire.....2
Procedure.....3
Use of Raffle.....3
Follow-Up Study.....3
Analysis of Data.....4

III. RESULTS.....5

Demographic Representativeness of Sample.....6

Composite Responses.....6

University-General Responses.....8
Activity Participation Responses.....13
Responses Concerning Communications.....17
Commuting Responses.....18
Responses Concerning Student Services.....19

Results of Crosstabulations.....20

Results of Follow-Up Study.....22

IV. SUMMARY.....25

The University in General.....25
Activity Participation.....26
Communications.....27
Student Services.....28
Crosstabulations.....28

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....29

APPENDICES

A. The Survey Questionnaire with Response Frequencies and Percentages
B. The Follow-Up Instrument
C. Chi-Square Significance & Asymmetric Lambdas by Dependent Variable

I. INTRODUCTION

Perhaps the most persistent and important problems facing Student Affairs administrators are determining the success or failure of existing programs and identifying current needs which may be met by new programs. The difficulty in solving these problems is compounded by the fact that most administrators either have little student contact or have frequent contact with the same group(s). Questioning every student is not practical because of the time required; therefore, a program of periodic surveys of random samples representative of the student body is the most efficient and effective means of obtaining student opinion.

At Youngstown State University, few studies of student characteristics or attitudes have been conducted; moreover the little research that has been done has focused for the most part upon specific issues (e.g. advisement, the student newspaper, food service, banking services, etc.) or upon specific groups of students (freshmen, transfer students, Continuing Education students, etc.). Nor has there been any systematic effort in the sense that studies are coordinated and part of a long-term program (largely because of insufficient staff time and limited funds).

The purposes of the present investigation were (1) to elicit student's attitudes concerning activities and services, the University in general, and access to information; and (2) to gather basic data about commuting and associated problems. It was hoped that the findings of this study could be useful in establishing a "baseline" in evaluating students' educational experiences at this institution; therefore it was determined to select a large sample size and to develop a fairly comprehensive research instrument.

II. PROCEDURE

Sample Selection

Because of the hypothesized heterogeneity of the target population and because only limited surveys of small samples have been conducted in the past, a sample size of 2000 was selected. The sample was obtained by selecting every eighth name from the computer print-out of all students (graduates and undergraduates) enrolled for the Fall Quarter, 1976; the population total was 15,998. The starting point was determined by selecting a two-digit number from a table of random numbers; since the random number was thirty-four, the thirty-fourth student was the first member of the sample selected.

The Questionnaire

The research instrument (See Appendix A) was developed with the assistance of Student Affairs staff members and was based upon several other survey instruments previously used in commuter-oriented research (obtained primarily from the National Clearing House for Commuter Programs). The questionnaire focused upon several general areas as indicated in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Questions by Area of Concern

GENERAL AREA	QUESTIONS	SUBTOTAL
Demographic Data	1-9, 11-13	12
University-General	16, 26, 28-30, 39-40, 47, 54	9
Activities Participation	18-21, 48-53, 55-77	33
Communications	17, 27, 31-33, 46	6
Commuting	10, 14-15, 22, 24-25, 34 37-38, 41-45	14
Student Services	23, 35-36, 78-97	23
	TOTAL	97

Obviously, primary emphasis was upon Activities Participation and upon Student Services. Table 2 on the following page more clearly defines these general areas by indicating specific foci. The six-page questionnaire included ninety-three separate items. (Four questions used required more than the five responses per question allowed by the optical scan sheet employed; therefore, responses to items 1, 19, 32, and 39 were continued in the item immediately following.)

Procedure

A cover letter, a copy of the questionnaire, and a scan sheet on which responses were to be marked were mailed to each student in the sample during the Fall Quarter, 1976. Budgetary limitations prevented use of the usual stamped, self-addressed return envelope; respondents were asked to return the completed survey to one of three locations on the campus within a two-week return period. One week prior to the deadline a post card reminder was sent to all who had not yet returned the questionnaire.

Use of Raffles

Because of the length of the questionnaire, the method of return, and very low response rates to previous mailed surveys, it was decided to award hand calculators in a drawing for which those who completed and/or returned the survey would be eligible; one calculator was to be awarded for every 500 responses.

Follow-Up Study

Although the use of sweepstakes, raffles, etc. is commonly used in the field of marketing to encourage sales, the use of such a method to encourage response to a scientific investigation has raised many an eyebrow of educational researchers. In order to obtain some idea of why students do not respond to surveys and to assess the importance of the calculator drawing to those students who did participate, a limited (N=59) follow-up survey was conducted by telephone. A copy of interview instrument used in this portion of the study is included in Appendix B.

Table 2. Specifics Included in General Areas/Topics

AREA/TOPIC	SPECIFIC CONCERNS
Demographic Data	School/College, Class Standing, Marital Status, Sex, Age, Race/Minority Status, Work Status, Housing, Courseload, Time at YSU, and Number of Dependent Children.
University-General	Advisement, Safety, Clerical Assistance, Quality of Education, Satisfaction with YSU, and Most Important Problem facing YSU students.
Activities Participation	Frequency of Participation, Reasons for Non-Participation Interest in Specific Programs, Best Times for Activities, Free Hour, and Student Government.
Communications	Are Students Well-Informed?, Best Way to Inform, and What Information is Hardest to Obtain?, and The Jambar.
Commuting	Commuting Distance, When On-Campus, Non-Class Hours on Campus, Expression of Opinions at Home, Where and How Non-Class Time Utilized, Mode of Transportation, Transportation Problems, Desirability of Bus Service, Convenience of Library Hours, Preference for Residential vs. Commuter Campus, Study Location, and Scheduling Problems.
Student Services	Knowledge and Utilization of All Major Student Services at YSU.

Analysis of Data

To determine sample representativeness in terms of selected demographic characteristics, sample proportions were compared to population proportions utilizing the Chi-Square (χ^2) statistic. Composite responses to the questionnaire and to the follow-up survey are reported by frequency and percentages. Cross-tabulations to determine significant differences extant among responses by certain demographic characteristics (the first eleven items of the questionnaire) were analyzed by means of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program, the primary statistic being Chi-Square.

Chi-Square is a test of statistical significance used to determine whether two variables are systematically related. The statistic is quite

useful in comparing proportions or entire distributions to determine the relationship of two variables but does not indicate how strong the relationship is or what variables account for the variance observed. A second weakness of Chi-Square is that when large samples are employed, "even miniscule deviations will generate a statistically significant chi-square. This is because larger samples are much more likely to approximate the true relationship in the universe" (Nie, et.al., 1970: 224).

In order to better evaluate the strength of significant Chi-Squares, Asymmetric Lambda was employed. According to Nie, et.al. (1970:225), "Asymmetric Lambda measures the percentage of improvement in our ability to predict the value of the dependent variable once we know the value of the independent variable." Lambda ranges from 0 (when the independent variable does not help in predicting the dependent variable) to 1.0 (when a perfect relationship exists).

An Asymmetric Lambda of .3464 indicates that the independent variable predicts the dependent variable 35.64% of the time, a very strong relationship, while an Asymmetric Lambda of .0024 indicates an improvement in prediction of only .24%, a very weak relationship. Asymmetric Lambda is not directly related to Chi-Square: for example, a Chi-Square significant at the .0001 level of confidence may generate a very small Asymmetric Lambda, even 0.0, indicating that although the relationship is statistically significant, it is quite weak in terms of predictability. (See Nie, et. al., 1970:225-226 and Harshbarger, 1971: 424-428 for a more detailed discussion of Asymmetric Lambda.)

III. RESULTS

Of the 2000 questionnaires and scan sheets distributed, a total of 940 were returned. The 47% return-rate is quite remarkable given the length of the instrument and method of return; indeed a response rate of between 20-40% would be considered "good" if a stamped return envelope had been enclosed.

Demographic Representativeness of Sample

To determine representativeness of the sample to the total population, sample proportions by school/college, class standing, sex, age, full-time/part-time status, and race/minority status were compared to population proportions; these proportions are given in Table 3. Using Chi-Square with a .01 level of significance, sample proportions were compared to population proportions. No significant differences were found, even at a .001 level of significance. Moreover, the sample and population proportions investigated were significantly the same at the .01 level. Thus, we may conclude that the sample is, indeed, representative of the population in terms of the demographic characteristics considered.

Population proportions by marital status, work status, housing, length of time at this institution, and number of dependents are not available. With regards to marital status, 71% of the respondents were single; 24%, married; 2%, divorced; 1% each, separated and widowed. Twenty-eight per cent of the sample work forty hours per week or more, 39% work thirty-nine hours or less, 17% are looking for work, and 14% do not want to work. Fifty-seven per cent of students responding live with parents or guardians, 27% are the head or co-head of a household, 4% reside in dormitories or fraternities/sororities, 6% share an apartment with at least one other student, and 6% live in a sleeping room or a private apartment. Seventy-two per cent of the sample have attended YSU for one to three years; 16%, for four to five years; 7%, for six to ten years; and 2%, for over ten years. In terms of the number of dependent children, 82% reported none; 6%, one child; 6%, two children, 3%, three children; and 2%, more than three children.

Composite Responses

Because of the length of the questionnaire, the need for brevity, and the writer's desire for a readable report, results for every response

Table 3. Population and Sample Proportions of Selected Characteristics.*

CHARACTERISTIC	POPULATION PROPORTION	SAMPLE PROPORTION
School/College		
CAST	.20	.26
A&S	.21	.23
BUSI	.18	.20
EDUC	.09	.03
ENGI	.07	.07
F&PA	.05	.04
GRAD	.12	.12
Class Standing		
FRESHMAN	.42	.32
SOPHOMORE	.19	.24
JUNIOR	.14	.13
SENIOR	.14	.16
GRADUATE	.12	.11
Sex		
MALE	.56	.50
FEMALE	.44	.49
Age		
UNDER 18	.01	.01
18-23	.63	.64
24-35	.20	.28
36-50	.06	.06
OVER 50	.01	.01
Full/Part-Time Status		
FULL-TIME	.64	.66
PART-TIME	.36	.33
Race/Minority Status		
AFRO-AMERICAN	.08	.07
AMERICAN-INDIAN	.0006	.003
CAUCASION	.91	.90
ORIENTAL	.001	.005
SPANISH SURNAME	.0045	.01

*Percentages may not total 100 per category because of rounding errors. Population data obtained from the Offices of Institutional Research and of Student Data Services.

option will not be discussed; rather, primary attention will be given to the response of the majority of respondents, to observable trends, and to particularly interesting minority responses. Conclusions and subjective opinions will be included in the following discussion in definance of tradition. The frequencies and associated percentages of responses by question are included on the questionnaire (see Appendix A).

University-General Responses

The first question in this category (item 16) concerned academic advisement. Of the 74% of the respondents indicating that they received academic advisement, some 59% were satisfied with the advisement they received, while 42% were not satisfied. Dissatisfaction with advisement is also indicated by responses to Question 39-40 which asked respondents to indicate the one most important problem facing YSU students: 16% of the sample indicated that advisement was the most important problem (exceeded only parking and course offerings). In a 1972 study conducted at this institution (Letchworth, et.al., 1972), 53% of the sample felt advisement was "very helpful" (9%) or "helpful" (44%), 20% said they were "indifferent," while 26% felt advisement was either "misleading" (13%) or "very misleading" (9%). There has apparently been little or no improvement in advisement over-all since 1972.

Table 4 presents the responses to Question 16 by School or College and by Class. Respondants in Engineering (53%), Applied Sciences and Technology (59%), and the Graduate School (49%)expressed the greatest satisfaction with advisement: students in Education (37%) and the Graduate School (36%) indicated the greatest dissatisfaction with the advisement process; and the "no" advisement option was more often picked by Business and Fine & Performing Arts students. Seniors expressed the greatest satisfaction with advisement (47% responded "yes"), while juniors appear most dissatisfied (36% replied "no"): sophomores were most apt to select the "no" advisement" option (30%). None of the

differences indicated in Table 4, however, were statistically significant,

Table 4. Responses to Q16, "Are you satisfied with the academic advisement you receive?", by school or college and by class.

VARIABLE	RESPONSE		
	YES	NO	NO ADVISEMENT
School/College			
CAST	50%	28%	21%
A&S	40%	31%	29%
BUSI.	34%	30%	36%
EDUC.	41%	37%	22%
ENGI.	53%	34%	14%
F&PA	39%	29%	33%
GRAD.	49%	36%	15%
Class			
FRESH.	41%	30%	29%
SOPH.	41%	29%	30%
JR.	42%	36%	21%
SR.	47%	32%	21%

and it is therefore not possible to determine which schools or colleges have the "best" advisement. Given that nearly one-third of all students responding expressed dissatisfaction with the advisement they receive, it seems to the writer that there is an advisement problem in all schools/colleges and at all levels; the School of Engineering cannot rest on its laurels (i.e., that more engineers were satisfied with advisement than students in the other schools) when one-third of the engineering students responding expressed dissatisfaction. Although there is no real evidence to support the conclusion, the writer feels that advisement is not so much a school/college problem (in terms of causality) as it is a <u>departmental</u> problem--or, more precisely, a problem of <u>certain</u> departments. The goals and objectives of the advisement process must be defined if advisement is to be objectively evaluated, and research should be conducted to determine the nature and magnitude of "the advisement problem". In the writer's opinion the first task should most appropriately be undertaken by the schools and colleges;

research on advisement might be conducted by Student Affairs in cooperation with the Deans of the Schools/Colleges--in any case, the problem should not continue to be "swept under the rug."

Question 26 asked respondents whether they felt as safe on campus during the evening as they do during the day. This question was included because lighting on the campus at night has been a continuing issue and because Student Government's Escort Service was justified largely on the argument that students, especially women, feel unsafe on campus at night. Forty-six per cent of the sample indicated that they did feel as safe at night as during the day, 39% said they did not feel as safe, and 15% said that they sometimes do not feel as safe at night. As might be expected, significant differences were found between male and female responses to this question:

Sex	Yes	No	Sometimes	No Response
Male	70%	21%	9%	0%
Female	22%	55%	20%	2%

Interestingly, responses to Question 30, which concerned use of the Escort Service, show no differences between males and females on any of the response options: only 2% of males and 2% of females responding indicated having used the service. It would seem that the Escort Service is not considered by respondents to be a solution to the safety-on-campus-at-night problem.

The value of assistance given to students by secretaries and receptionists was the focus of Question 28. Seventy-five per cent of the respondents selected the "very helpful" (25%) and the "helpful" (50%) options. Only 5% said that such assistance was "misleading" (4%) or "very misleading" (1%). In the 1972 study conducted on this campus, 72% of the sample said that the assistance of secretaries/receptionists was "very helpful" (20%) or "helpful" (52%) while 12% found such assistance "misleading" (9%) or "very misleading" (3%). Although student

attitudes have become only slightly more positive with regards to secretarial assistance, they have become considerably less negative.

Question 29 asked respondents to rate the quality of their education at YSU on a five-point scale ranging from Excellent to Poor. Sixty-seven per cent responded "excellent" or "good". The findings on this item are most interesting when compared to an earlier study at this institution and to a report released in mid-January, 1977 by the Carnegie Council on Policies Studies in Higher Education. The latter report discusses responses of 25,000 undergraduates and 25,000 graduates (Higher Education and National Affairs, 1977) and provides the responses of students to the question "how satisfied are you with the education you are receiving?" which was included in surveys conducted in 1969 and 1975. In the 1972 study conducted at this institution (Letchworth, et.al., 1972), one question asked "how would you rate YSU as an educational institution?" response options were the same as those in Question 29 of the present study. The following chart compares the responses to these questions in the four studies.

LOCAL STUDIES			CARNEGIE COUNCIL STUDIES		
Response	1972 Percentages	1976 Percentages	Response	1969 Percentages	1975 Percentages
Excellent	5%	13%	Very Satisfied	19%	19%
Good	37%	54%	Satisfied	47%	52%
Average	44%	29%	On the Fence	22%	20%
Below Average	12%	3%	Dissatisfied	9%	7%
Poor	2%	1%	Very Dissat.	3%	2%

It seems obvious that the "Wick Tech"/"Wick High"/"UCLA" (University on the corner of Lincoln Avenue) image which was prevalent in the early 1970s has been replaced by a considerably more positive image. This conclusion is also supported by responses to Question 30 and 47, as discussed below.

Question 30, which asked respondents "how have you found YSU," is identical to a question asked in the 1972 survey by Letchworth, et.al.; responses to this question in the present study and the 1972 survey are

summarized in the following chart:

Response	1972 Percentages	1976 Percentages
Better than anticipated	36%	41%
Same as anticipated	48%	49%
Worse than anticipated	16%	9%

Either students' expectations have changed or the institution is better meeting their expectations--or a little of both.

The respondents' perceptions of the single most important problem facing YSU students was the concern of Questions 39-40. Of the eight possible problem areas listed, parking was identified as the most important student problem by 32% of the respondents; "course offerings" was selected by 19% of the subjects, and 16% chose "advisement." Since the number of student parking spaces is adequate, it seems obvious, at least to the writer, that the "parking problem" is not one of availability but one of convenience; this should not be surprising given the commuter nature of the institution and the high percentage of students employed full or part-time. "Course offerings," the second most important problem indicated, is difficult to interpret because the phrase could refer to problems with scheduling certain classes, dissatisfaction with the content of courses, etc. Since 54% of the respondents indicated, in answer to Question 44, that they had "frequently" (13%) or "occasionally" (41%) had difficulty taking certain courses because of [illegible] commuting, it would seem likely that scheduling problems largely account for the selection of "course offerings" as a major problem facing students. That "advisement" was the third most frequently picked as the most important problem is not surprising considering responses to Question 16, discussed above.

Question 47, which asked respondents whether they would recommend this institution to their friends, was a duplicate of a question asked in the 1972 study by Letchworth, et.al. and was included as an indicator of student satisfaction with the University. Responses to this question were as follows:

Response	1972 Percentages	1976 Percentages
Definitely	14%	29%
Probably	49%	46%
Uncertain	15%	16%
Probably Not	18%	7%
Definitely Not	4%	2%

Again we see a definite improvement in students' attitudes concerning this institution.

The last question in the University-General area, Question 54, asked whether the respondent felt the institution was interested in him or her as an individual. Forty-three per cent of the sample indicated that they did not feel the University was interested in them as individuals; 39% responded in the affirmative to the question, 4% indicating "yes, always" and 35% responding "yes, usually." Although the researcher strongly feels that more individual attention is a worthwhile goal, it is rather surprising that affirmative responses were given by over one-third of the respondents given the commuter nature of the campus.

Activity Participation Responses

Question 18 asked how often respondents had participated in extracurricular events. Forty-five per cent of the sample indicated that they had not participated in any extracurricular activities, 35% had attended events one to three times per quarter, 11% said they attended events four to six times per quarter, and 8% said they participated in extracurricular activities seven or more times per quarter. Given the commuter nature of the campus, it is encouraging that 54% of the respondents participated in or attended at least some extracurricular activities.

Questions 19-20 focused on the reasons for a respondent's limited or non-existent participation. Because of the diversity of the responses the options and percentages of those selecting each option are presented in the following chart:

Response	Percentage	Response	Percentage
Not Interested	13%	Study time conflicts	12%
Transportation problems	5%	No pertinent organizations	6%
Family obligations	15%	Busy with off-campus groups	11%
Working hours conflict	27%	Other	4%
Students cliquey	7%		

Obviously conflicting working hours was the most frequently cited reason for limited participation. Respondents' perceptions of the responsiveness of Student Government to their needs and interests was the focus of Question 21. Of the 40% of the subjects who felt Student Government was at least somewhat responsive, 63% responded "sometimes", 35% said "most of the time", and 2% said "always". Question 59 asked respondents to indicate their interest in Student Government. Forty-nine per cent said it was "of no interest"; 42%, "of some interest"; and 8%, "of major interest". The writer's experience with student governments on three campuses suggests that these findings are, at worst, typical of most campuses and are therefore positive given the commuter nature of the campus.

Questions 48 and 49 concerned the possibility of establishing a "free hour" when no classes were scheduled. Question 48 asked respondents if they would be interested in a "free hour"; only 19% responded "yes" while 46% responded "no", and 21% said "don't care." The following question asked how respondents would use a "free hour" if established 29% said "recreation or entertainment", 22% said "studying", and 31% said "don't know." These findings are not surprising in light of previous research concerning commuter students which has typically found that commuters try to minimize their time on campus when scheduling. (See Flanagan, 1976).

The best times to schedule activities was the focus of Questions 50 through 53. "Afternoons and evenings" (36%) and "evenings" (25%) were the most frequent responses to Question 50. There was little consensus concerning when afternoon events should be scheduled, but

63% of respondents felt that evening events should begin either at 7:00 p.m. (31%) or at 8:00 p.m. (32%). With regards to Saturday activities, 54% said they would attend an activity held on a Saturday, and 26% responded "depends on work schedule."

The respondents' interest in specific activities was investigated in Questions 55 through 77 which listed some twenty existing programs and three potential activity emphasis areas. Respondents were asked whether the activity was "of no interest", "of some interest", or "of major interest". More than 50% of the respondents expressed no interest in five areas: participation in varsity athletics as a player (70%), fraternities and sororities (70%), activities for married students (69%), activities for older students (62%), and activities for minority students (74%). Nine activities were either "of some interest" or "of major interest" to 70% or more of the sample: varsity athletics--as a spectator (54%, "of some interest"; 20% "of major interest"), social activities (55%; 23%), outdoor recreation (50%; 31%), films (55%; 32%), concerts/musical performances (38%; 51%), interest clubs (50%; 20%), music-listening room in Kilcawley Center (50%; 22%), swimming (49%; 31%), and Beeghly Center facilities (47%; 36%). The high interest in athletics and recreation among YSU students certainly supports Student Government's push for a full-time intramural/recreation staff member.

Of the twenty-three activities listed in Questions 55 to 77, three are not currently available to students at this institution: Activities for Married Students, for Older Students, and for Minority Students (Questions 67 to 69). Thirty-one per cent of the respondents indicated some or major interest in activities for married students; 39% had some or major interest in activities for older students, and 25% expressed some or major interest in minority student activities. A different picture emerges, however, when the responses of married,

older (over 23), and minority students to Questions 67, 68, and 69, respectively, are examined:

A. RESPONSES OF MARRIED STUDENTS CONCERNING ACTIVITIES FOR MARRIEDS

No Interest	Some Interest	Major Interest
64 (28%)	92 (40%)	73 (32%)

B. RESPONSES OF STUDENTS OVER 23 CONCERNING ACTIVITIES FOR OLDER STUDENTS

Age	No Interest	Some Interest	Major Interest
24-35	101 (38%)	88 (34%)	73 (28%)
36-50	13 (23%)	27 (48%)	16 (29%)
Over 50	2 (22%)	2 (22%)	5 (56%)

C. RESPONSES OF MINORITY STUDENTS CONCERNING ACTIVITIES FOR MINORITIES

Group	No Interest	Some Interest	Major Interest
Black	18 (23%)	22 (28%)	38 (48%)
Amer-Indian	3 (75%)	0	1 (25%)
Oriental	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)
Spanish	2 (18%)	4 (36%)	5 (46%)

It can be seen that 72% of the married students responding desired activities for married students; 77% of those 36 to 50 years of age and 78% of those over 50 desired activities for older students; and 76% of black students, 80% of orientals, and 82% of Spanish-surnamed students desired activities for minority students. Unfortunately the question sheds no light on what kinds of activities are desired by these groups, and this should be a concern of future research. (An investigation of activities/services desired by black students is currently in process.) The writer strongly feels these areas should not be ignored given the size of these groups but recognizes the difficulties which must be surmounted in identifying members of these groups (although a list of ethnic/racial minority students is available, we cannot yet obtain computer print-outs of all students, say, over 35 or of all married students).

Responses Concerning Communications

Since the Student Publications Committee recommended a regular survey of student attitudes concerning the campus newspaper (The Jambar) be conducted, two questions concerning the paper were included in the present survey; the second of these questions was also asked in the 1972 survey by Letchworth, et.al. The first question (item 17) asked if the respondents read The Jambar: thirty-two per cent said they "always" read the paper, 42% said "frequently," 21% said seldom," and 4% responded "never". These responses were quite different from those to a similar question in a survey conducted Winter Quarter, 1976 (Bertelsen, 1976): 63% of the respondents indicated that they read the paper "twice a week"; 24%, "once a week"; and 9%, "once a month". The writer's subjective feeling is that the difference is accounted for either by a biased sample in the 1976 study or by differing interpretations of the terms used rather than by an actual change in the frequency with which The Jambar is read; further investigation in this area seems appropriate. The second question concerning the campus newspaper, item 27, asked respondents what they thought of the quality of The Jambar; responses to this question are presented in the chart below and are compared with the responses to the same question in the 1972 study by Letchworth, et.al.

Response	1972 Percentages	1976 Percentages
Very informative	7%	15%
Good, but coverage should be increased	44%	44%
No Opinion	14%	21%
Generally poor	21%	9%
Needs substantial change	13%	11%

Obviously the proportion feeling the paper is "very informative" has more than doubled, while the percentage feeling The Jambar is "generally poor" is less than one-half as large.

The fact that there is a problem with communications on the campus, at least in terms of knowledge of up-coming events, is shown by responses to Question 31: only 10% of the respondents felt they were "very informed" and 50% of the sample said they were "somewhat informed".

Questions 32 and 33 attempted to determine the best way to inform students of upcoming events and activities. Respondents gave primary emphasis to "mailings to each student" (24%) and to "The Jambar" (23%) and gave secondary emphasis to "posters and flyers" (13%), "information center" (13%), and "radio/TV" (12%).

The last question relating to communications (item 46) asked "in which of the following areas is campus information hardest to get?" Thirty-three per cent indicated they had "no difficulty getting information", 33% pointed the finger at "academic information", and 21% indicated that information about "student services" was most difficult to obtain.

Commuting Responses

As was indicated in Table 1, fourteen questions were devoted to commuting, time utilization, and associated problems. Question 10 asked respondents how far they commuted (one way); 44% of the sample travel 4-11 miles to campus; 18%, 12 to 20 miles; and 17%, 1-3 miles. As indicated by responses to Question 38, 80% of the respondents drive their own car to the campus. "Parking at YSU" was picked by 49% of the sample as their primary transportation problem (Question 42). Nevertheless, 41% of respondents indicated they would not take advantage of a bus service if such a service was established (Question 43). Seventy-five per cent of the sample indicated, in response to Question 34, that library hours were convenient. Seventy per cent of respondents do most of their studying at home (Question 37), and 76% indicated they can readily express their opinions and feelings at home (Question 22).

Fifty-four per cent of students responding are usually on-campus during the day, while 21% are on-campus evenings (Question 14). Although 62% spend at least one to five non-class hours per day on the campus, 26% reported spending no non-class time on-campus (Question 15). While on-campus, most time between classes is spent in Kilcawley Center (33%) or Maag Library (26%), according to responses to Question 24, and the primary activities upon which time is spent on-campus were "working" (42%) and "studying" (26%). Forty-five per cent of the respondents have never had scheduling problems because of commuting, but 41% reported problems "occasionally" and 13%, "frequently" (Question 44). "Conflicting working hours" (45%), "don't want to take night classes" (25%), and "transportation problems" (15%) were the reasons most frequently given in response to Question 45 for why respondents had scheduling problems. Question 25 asked respondents whether they would prefer a residential or a commuter campus if they had a choice: 43% said they would prefer a residential campus, and 40% preferred a commuter campus.

Responses Concerning Student Services

The first question in this category, item 23, asked respondents whether enough student services are provided. Fifty-four per cent responded in the affirmative; 20%, in the negative; and 24% said "don't know." Orientation for new students was considered important by 82% of the respondents (Question 35); "academic advisement and requirements" was picked by 65% of the sample as the area which should be most emphasized in the orientation program (Question 36).

Questions 78 through 79 listed twenty student services currently available and asked respondents whether they had heard of the service and, if so, how often they had used the service. At least 40% of the respondents had never heard of handicapped services (51%), international student services (42%), campus ministry (50%), leadership workshops

(73%), student development (52%), discount tickets to cultural events (44%) and communication seminars (70%). The most frequently used services were Career Planning and Placement, Counseling, Financial Aids (including on-campus student employment), tutoring, and the Student Activities office. Of these, 45% of the sample reported having used financial aids at least once, and 32% had used the counseling service at least once: the highest use figures obtained were for these areas.

Results of Crosstabulations

In order to assess the influences of members of various demographic groupings on the composite responses, a series of cross-tabulations using the SPSS program package was performed. Dependent variables were defined as the demographic characteristics requested in the first eleven questions of the survey instrument, to wit, SCHOOL/COLLEGE, CLASS STANDING, MARITAL STATUS, SEX, AGE, RACE/MINORITY STATUS, WORK STATUS, HOUSING, COMMUTING DISTANCE, and PART-TIME/FULL-TIME STATUS. Essentially the SPSS program facilitated analysis of responses to Question 12 through 97 by demographic group: for example, responses to each question (12-97) by freshmen were compared to the responses of sophomores, juniors, and seniors to determine whether class standing influenced responses to the questions. Chi-Square and Asymmetric Lambda were the statistics employed in the analysis. A total of 946 crosstabulations were computed. (See Appendix C for Chi-Square Significance & Asymmetric Lambdas for all relationships studied.)

As was expected, a large number of significant Chi-Squares were found for the crosstabulations computed: 529 (56%) of the relationships analyzed produced Chi-Squares significant at the .01 level of confidence. Table 5 provides the number of significant Chi-Squares, the range of Asymmetric Lambdas, and the mean of Asymmetric Lambdas by dependent variable.

Table 5. . Number of Significant X^2s, Range of Asymmetric Lambdas, and Means of Asymmetric Lambdas by Dependent Variables.

DEPENDENT VARIABLE*	NO. SIGNIFICANT X^2s (=.01)	RANGE OF ASYMMETRIC LAMBDAS	MEAN OF ASYMMETRIC LAMBDAS
001. School/ College	35	.0 to .03040	.005
002. School/ College	74	.0 to .13896	.019
003. Class	64	.0 to .04663	.003
004. Marital Status	63	.0 to .40108	.022
005. Sex	12	.00215 to .46667	.055
006. Age	51	.0 to .30655	.015
007. Race	30	.0 to .36970	.016
008. Work Status	48	.0 to .22767	.028
009. Housing	57	.0 to .34975	.021
010. Commuting	40	.0 to .12786	.004
011. Course Load	54	.0 to .13466	.004

*Variable number is same as question number.

When Asymmetric Lambdas for each of the significant relationships are analyzed, it becomes evident that our ability to predict responses to the questions is improved only minimally by knowledge of the variables listed: as shown by the means of Asymmetric Lambdas provided in Table 5, knowledge of the dependent variables listed improves our ability to predict responses to the other variables only 6% at best (in the case of Sex).

Table 6 lists all variables relationships which generated Asymmetric Lambdas equal to or greater than .20000; only one per cent of all cross tabulations produced an Asymmetric Lambda of this magnitude or greater, of which only two relationships produced a Lambda greater than .40000 (marital status is related to number of children, and women students are more likely to feel concern for their safety on campus at night.

Table 6. Relationships Generating Asymmetric Lambdas Equal to or Greater than .20000; in all cases X^2 significance at .01 level was .0.

DEPENDENT VARIABLE	INDEPENDENT VARIABLE	ASYMMETRIC LAMBDA
004. Marital Status	013. Number of Children	.40103
005. Sex	026. Campus Safety	.46667
006. Age	013. Number of Children	.30655
007. Race	087. Use of Testing Service	.36970
007. Race	088. Use of Tutoring Service	.23636
007. Race	090. Use of Escort Service	.31515
008. Work Status	014. When on Campus	.22767
009. Housing	013. Number of Children	.34975
009. Housing	019. Why Limited Activities	.20690
009. Housing	067. Married Student Activ.	.21102

In summary, knowledge of the demographic variables listed above does little to improve our ability to predict responses to the questions asked. This result is quite surprising since theoretically such variables are "supposed" to have some significance. This is not to say that other demographic or socio-economic characteristics would be unimportant but only that the variables studied had little effect in the present study.

Results of Follow-Up Study

As indicated above, a limited follow-up study (N=59) was conducted in order to begin to assess why students do not respond to surveys and to assess the importance of the calculator drawing to those students who participated in the study. Of the fifty-nine students contacted, 27 or 46% did not return the instrument, 23 (39%) did do so, and 9 (15%) indicated that they did not receive it. No attempt was made to determine whether the members of the follow-up sample were representative of the total population; therefore results must be considered tentative at best.

Table 7 shows the responses to Question 1 and 2 of the follow-up instrument by school, sex, class, and enrollment status. The results suggest that freshmen or sophomores, females, and students in the schools of Applied Science & Technology, Education, and Engineering are less likely to respond than are seniors and graduate students, males, or students in Arts and Sciences, Business, or Graduate Schools.

Table 7. School, Sex, Class, and Enrollment Status of Follow-Up Sample (N=59).

VARIABLE	DID NOT RETURN	COMPLETED & RETURNED	DID NOT RECEIVE
School/College:			
CAST	10 (37%)	6 (26%)	4 (44%)
A&S	5 (19%)	7 (30%)	0 --
BUS.	3 (11%)	3 (13%)	2 (22%)
ED.	3 (11%)	2 (9%)	0
ENG.	3 (11%)	1 (4%)	0
F&PA	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0
GRAD.	2 (7%)	3 (13%)	2 (22%)
Not Enrolled	0 --	0 --	1 --
Sex:			
MALE	14 (52%)	13 (56%)	6 (67%)
FEMALE	13 (48%)	10 (43%)	3 (33%)
Class:			
FRESH.	11 (41%)	8 (35%)	3 (33%)
SOPH.	10 (37%)	5 (22%)	1 (11%)
JR.	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	2 (22%)
SR.	3 (11%)	6 (26%)	0 --
GRAD.	2 (7%)	2 (9%)	2 (22%)
Not Enrolled	0 --	0 --	1 (11%)
Enrollment Status:			
PART-TIME	16 (59%)	11 (48%)	5 (56%)
FULL-TIME	11 (41%)	12 (52%)	3 (33%)
Not Enrolled	0 --	0 --	1 --
TOTALS	27	23	9

Table 8 presents responses to Question 3 which asked respondents who returned the survey how important the calculator drawing was in their decision to do so. Twenty-six per cent stated that the calculator was "very important" (22%) or "important" (4%) in their decision while 74% said it was "not very important" (43%) or "not at all important" (30%). Whether these responses accurately reflect the population, whether students responded truthfully, whether the 22% who felt the calculator was "very important" would have completed the questionnaire without the drawing--these questions are not answered, and the writer is therefore hesitant to suggest, much less conclude, that the drawing had little effect. Indeed, the 47% response rate of the main study suggests the opposite.

Table 8. Importance of Drawing in Decision to Participate in Study.

RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PER CENT
Very Important	5	22%
Important	1	4%
Not Very Important	10	43%
Not At All Important	7	30%

Table 9 gives responses to Question 4. The most frequently cited reasons for not returning the survey were "forgot" (44%) and "no time to complete" (33%). This underlines the importance of using follow-up notices to increase response rate.

Table 9. Reasons Why Survey Instruments Not Returned.

REASON	FREQUENCY	PER CENT
Forgot	12	44%
No Time to Complete	9	33%
Lost	2	7%
Did not think anything would be done with results	1	4%
Did not think YSU would be interested in my views	1	4%
Other	2	7%

IV. SUMMARY

The most salient findings of the present investigation are summarized below by the major areas of concern. The reader is cautioned that the term "student" is used in this section to refer only to respondents in this study.

The University in General

1. Students are quite positive concerning their perceptions of the quality of education at this institution and would recommend the University to their friends. They were also very positive about the assistance provided by secretaries and receptionists: 75% of the sample felt such assistance was either "very helpful" or "helpful".

2. Academic advisement continues to be a major problem area: in the present study, 31% of all respondents and 42% of those receiving advisement expressed dissatisfaction with the advisement they receive(d); the problem is evident in all schools or colleges and in all class levels and thus, the writer feels, is more of a "departmental problem" than it is a "school problem" in terms of the source(s) of the problem. The present investigation does not, of course, pin-point the cause of dissatisfaction; inadequate advisement, misleading advisement, difficulty in locating advisors, changing requirements, a misunderstanding of the purposes of advisement, etc.--all may figure in the definition of the problem and should be investigated to determine a more precise understanding of the problem.

3. Convenient parking, safety on campus at night, and "scheduling" are also problem areas of concern to students.

4. Although a plurality of students (43%) did not feel the institution was interested in them as individuals, 39% felt that the University was at least "usually" concerned with students as individuals. This seems rather positive given the commuter nature of the campus.

Activity Participation

5. A majority of students (54%) participate in extracurricular activities at least once per quarter. Reasons for limited participation were quite diverse: 27% said working hours conflicted, 15% cited family obligations, 13% indicated no interest, 12% said study time conflicted, and 11% were busy with off-campus groups.

6. One-half of the respondents expressed interest in Student Government and 40% felt Student Government was at least "somewhat responsive" to their needs. Given the typically weak support of Student Governments on most campuses, these findings are interpreted as quite positive, especially given the fact that this is a commuter campus.

7. Most respondents were not in favor of a "free hour" when no classes are scheduled. If such a period existed, most students would use the time for recreation or entertainment (29%) or studying (22%). This finding tends to support the frequent conclusion of research on commuters that commuter students try to minimize time on campus when scheduling. (See Flanagan, 1976 and Harrington, 1972 for summaries of the literature on commuter students.)

8. Afternoons and evenings seem to be the best time for extracurricular activities to be scheduled. Most students would attend a Saturday event if they were interested and if they were not working.

9. Activities of greatest interest to respondents in order of priority were (1) concerts/musical performances, (2) films, (3) use of Beeghly Physical Education Center facilities, (4) outdoor recreation, (5) swimming, (6) social activities, (7) varsity athletics (as a spectator), (8) music-listening rooms in Kilcawley Center, and (9) interest clubs. These findings counter the usual conclusion of research on commuters that commuting students are primarily concerned with academically-related activities and events.

10. Seventy-two per cent of the married students expressed interest

in activities for marrieds: 77% of those 36 to 50 years of age and 78% of those over 50 desired activities specifically for older students; and 76% of black students, 80% of orientals, and 82% of Spanish-surnamed students want activities for minority students. Further research in these areas should be conducted.

Communications

11. Most students read The Jambar and feel the newspaper is of good quality; nearly one-half (44%) of the students, however, feel that coverage should be increased.

12. Since 58% of the students were only "somewhat informed" of upcoming activities and events, there does, indeed, seem to be a communication problem on the campus. Mailings to each student was selected by 24% of the sample as the best way to inform students, while 23% said The Jambar was the best way.

13. One-third of the sample indicated they had no difficulty obtaining information on campus; an equal proportion, however, find getting academic information difficult and 21% reported problems obtaining information about student services.

Commuting

14. An almost perfect bell-shaped curve was found when students were asked how far they drove to school (one way); a plurality (44%) drive 4-11 miles to the University. Eighty per cent of the students drive their own cars, and it is not surprising that parking was selected by 49% of respondents as their primary transportation problem. Nevertheless, 41% of the sample would not use a bus service if such a service were available.

15. The majority of students (54%) are on the campus during the day, and 62% spend at least 1-5 non-class hours on campus. Most time between classes is spent either in Kilcawley Center or Maag Library; the primary non-class activities on campus are working (selected by 42% of

the sample) and studying (26%). Seventy per cent, however, do most of their studying at home. Library hours were convenient to 75% of the sample.

16. Seventy-six per cent of the sample said they can readily express their opinions and feelings at home.

17. Occasional or frequent scheduling problems were reported by 41% of the sample, the major reason cited being conflicting working hours.

18. Students are almost equally split on their preference for either a residential or a commuter campus: 43% preferred a residential campus; 40% preferred a commuter campus.

Student Services

19. The majority of respondents (54%) felt that sufficient student services were currently available. Interestingly, nearly one-fourth (24%) indicated that they did not know if enough services existed.

20. Eighty-two per cent of the sample felt orientation is important; 65% said "academic advisement and requirements" should be the area of greatest emphasis.

21. Except for seven services designed for specific groups (e.g., services for the handicapped, international student services, etc.), most students (70% or more) are aware of services available to them. Financial aids and counseling showed the highest use figures.

Crosstabulations

22. It would appear that the demographic variables studied (School/College, Class, Marital Status, Sex, Age, Race/Minority Status, Work Status, Housing, Commuting Distance, and Class Load) have little effect upon the composite responses to the questions of the present study. The writer concludes that (at least on this campus when this study was completed) a stratified sample is not necessary; rather, effort should be made to obtain as large a sample as possible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bertelsen, C. David. "A Report of the Student Affairs Survey of Student Attitudes Concerning The Jambar." Youngstown State University, 1976. (Unpublished paper.)

Flanagan, Dan. "The Commuter Student in Higher Education: A Synthesis of the Literature," NASPA Journal, Vol. 13, No. 3 (Winter, 1976), pp. 35-41.

Harrington, Thomas F. "The Literature on the Commuter Student," Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 13, No. 6 (November, 1972), pp. 546-549.

Harshbarger, Thad R. Introductory Statistics: A Decision Map. New York: Macmillan, 1971.

Higher Education and National Affairs. "Faculty, Student Opinions in 1975 Compared to 1969," Vol. 26, No. 2 (January 14, 1977).

Letchworth, George E., C. David Bertelsen, and Edith Painter. "Student Attitude Survey, 1972." Youngstown State University, 1972. (Unpublished paper.)

Nie, Norman H., C. Hadlai-Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karim Steinbrenner, and Dale H. Bent. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Second Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

APPENDIX A: THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE WITH RESPONSE FREQUENCIES & PERCENTAGES

STUDENT OPINION SURVEY

One of the most important ways to determine the success or failure of existing programs and to identify current student needs is conducting periodic surveys of student opinions. To ensure a scientifically random sample, it is essential that YOU participate in this survey. A few moments of your time will ensure the accuracy of the results and will, therefore, provide more valid information upon which policy decisions can be made.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Print your name and phone number on the last page of the questionnaire in the space provided (for drawing only).
2. Use the pencil provided to mark your answers on the IBM scan sheet.
3. Make pencil marks as dark as possible and try to keep the marks within the lines.
4. ONLY ONE RESPONSE MAY BE GIVEN PER QUESTION. If responses are continued in the next number (for example, numbers 1 & 2), please give only one answer to both questions.
5. "Other" responses must be written on the questionnaire, not on the scan sheet.

****

1. School or College:*

22%	248	(a) Applied Sciences & Technology
21%	238	(b) Arts & Sciences
18%	197	(c) Business
11%	120	(d) Education
6%	71	(e) Engineering
	66	-U**

2. School or College (Cont.):

9%	99	(a) Fine & Performing Arts
13%	101	(b) Graduate
	700	-U

3. Class Standing:

32%	297	(a) Freshman
24%	224	(b) Sophomore
18%	170	(c) Junior
16%	146	(d) Senior
11%	100	(e) Graduate
	3	-U

4. Marital Status:

71%	671	(a) Single
24%	228	(b) Married
2%	23	(c) Divorced
1%	8	(d) Separated
1%	8	(e) Widowed
	2	-U

5. Sex:

50%	474	(a) Male
49%	462	(b) Female
	4	-U

6. Age:

1%	9	(a) Under 18
64%	605	(b) 18-23
28%	261	(c) 24-35
6%	56	(d) 36-50
1%	9	(e) Over 50

7. Race/Minority Status:

7%	69	(a) Afro-American/Black
0%	3	(b) American Indian
90%	843	(c) Caucasian
0%	5	(d) Oriental
1%	11	(e) Spanish Surname
1%	9	-U

8. Work Status:

28%	267	(a) 40 hrs/wk or more
39%	370	(b) 39 hrs/wk or less
17%	164	(c) Looking for work
14%	134	(d) Don't want to work
	7	-U

9. Housing:

57%	533	(a) Live with parents/guardians
4%	38	(b) Dorm or fraternity/sorority
6%	55	(c) Share apartment
6%	55	(d) Sleeping room/private apt.
27%	257	(e) Head or co-head of household
	2	-U

10. Commuting Distance (One Way):

10%	99	(a) Less than 1 mile
17%	157	(b) 1-3 miles
44%	418	(c) 4-11 miles
18%	171	(d) 12-20 miles
10%	91	(e) Over 20

* In the case of double questions, blank or inappropriate responses were not included in computation of percentages.

** "U" designates blanks or inappropriate responses.

11. Number of hours (this quarter):

14% 131 (a) 1-5
18% 170 (b) 6-11
58% 541 (c) 12-16
7% 69 (d) 17-19
1% 11 (e) Over 19

18-U

12. How long have you been attending classes at YSU?

72% 678 (a) 1-3 years
16% 153 (b) 4-5 years
7% 69 (c) 6-10 years
2% 18 (d) Over 10 Years

22-U

13. Number of Dependent Children:

82% 769 (a) None
6% 56 (b) One
6% 65 (c) Two
3% 30 (d) Three
2% 18 (e) More than three

2-U

14. When are you usually on campus?

54% 503 (a) Days
21% 196 (b) Evenings
9% 85 (c) Afternoon & Evenings
9% 89 (d) Mornings & Evenings
6% 58 (e) Other (Please specify here: _____)

9-U

15. On the average, how many non-class hours per day do you spend on the campus?

26% 241 (a) None
62% 587 (b) 1-5
8% 79 (c) 6-10
1% 9 (d) 11-15
2% 23 (e) Over 15

1-U

16. Are you satisfied with the academic advisement you receive?

43% 408 (a) Yes
31% 290 (b) No
25% 236 (c) Don't receive advisement

6-U

17. Do you read the Jambar?

32% 302 (a) Always
42% 398 (b) Frequently
21% 200 (c) Seldom
4% 37 (d) Never

3-U

18. Have you participated in or attended extra-curricular events at YSU?

45% 432 (a) No
35% 333 (b) 1-3 times per quarter
11% 103 (c) 4-6 times per quarter
8% 80 (d) 7 or more times per quarter

2-U

19. If you do not participate in extra-curricular activities or if your participation is limited, what is the primary reason?

13% 125 (a) Not interested
5% 50 (b) Transportation problems
15% 143 (c) Family obligations
27% 257 (d) Working hours conflict
12% 113 (e) Study time conflict

RESPONSES CONTINUED IN #20

252-U

20. (a) No pertinent organization
6% 58 (b) Busy with off-campus groups
11% 102 (c) Students at campus events too cliquey
7% 65 (d) Other (Please specify here: _____)
4% 42

673-U

21. Do you think Student Government responds to your wishes and represents your interests?

12% 118 (a) No
25% 233 (b) Sometimes
14% 137 (c) Most of the time
1% 8 (d) Always
48% 451 (e) Don't know

3-U

22. Can you readily express your opinions and feelings at home?

76% 711 (a) Yes
4% 43 (b) No
19% 178 (c) Sometimes

8-U

23. Do you feel YSU provides enough services for students?

54% 506 (a) Yes
20% 188 (b) No
24% 231 (c) Don't know

15-U

24. Where do you spend most of your time between classes?

26% 248 (a) Library
33% 310 (b) Kilcawley Center
5% 50 (c) Empty classrooms
17% 164 (d) Home
14% 132 (e) Other (Please specify here: _____)

36-U

25. If you had a choice, would you prefer to attend a residential campus or a commuter campus such as YSU?

43% 404 (a) Residential campus
40% 373 (b) Commuter campus
17% 160 (c) Don't know

3-U

26. Do you feel as safe on campus in the evening as you do during the day?
46% 437 (a) Yes
38% 355 (b) No
15% 137 (c) Sometimes
11-U

27. What do you think of the quality of the Jambar?
15% 140 (a) Very informative
44% 409 (b) Good, but coverage should be increased
21% 202 (c) No opinion
9% 84 (d) Generally poor
11% 102 (e) Needs substantial change
3-U

28. How would you describe the assistance given to you by secretaries and receptionists?
25% 231 (a) Very helpful
50% 475 (b) Helpful
20% 189 (c) Indifferent
4% 34 (d) Misleading
1% 10 (e) Very misleading
1-U

29. How would you rate the education you are getting at YSU?
13% 119 (a) Excellent
54% 512 (b) Good
29% 270 (c) Average
3% 29 (d) Below average
1% 9 (e) Poor
1-U

30. How have you found YSU?
41% 389 (a) Better than anticipated
49% 459 (b) Same as anticipated
9% 88 (c) Worse than anticipated
4-U

31. How well informed are you of upcoming events on campus?
18% 171 (a) Very informed
58% 548 (b) Somewhat informed
12% 110 (c) Uncertain
11% 107 (d) Not informed
4-U

32. What would be the best way to inform YSU students of events & activities?
23% 217 (a) The Jambar
13% 154 (b) Posters & flyers
2% 20 (c) Word-of-mouth
6% 67 (d) Vindicator
24% 284 (e) Mailings to each student
RESPONSES CONTINUED IN #33

33. (a) Information Center
13% 159 (b) New publications
4% 50 (c) Radio-TV
12% 141 (d) Other (Please specify here; _____)
3% 35
555-U

34. Are library hours convenient for you as a commuter?
75% 703 (a) Yes
4% 40 (b) No
9% 88 (c) Depends upon work schedule
6% 61 (d) Depends upon class schedule
3% 32 (e) Other (Please specify here; _____)
16-U

35. Do you think an orientation program for new students is important?
82% 767 (a) Yes
11% 104 (b) No
6% 61 (c) Don't know
8-U

36. What do you think an orientation program should emphasize?
65% 610 (a) Academic advisement & requirements
6% 53 (b) Information about extra-curricular activities
9% 85 (c) Physical facilities
6% 52 (d) Meeting other students
10% 96 (e) Other (Please specify here: _____)
44-U

37. Where do you spend most of your time studying?
17% 159 (a) Library
4% 34 (b) Classroom buildings
5% 51 (c) Kilcawly Center
70% 662 (d) Home
3% 27 (e) Other (Please specify here: _____)
5-U

38. How do you usually get to campus?
80% 748 (a) Own car
3% 28 (b) Bus
9% 84 (c) Walk
1% 6 (d) Bike or motorcycle
8% 74 (e) Car pool

39. Which of the following areas includes the ONE most important problem facing the YSU student at this time, in your opinion?
3% 40 (a) Extra-curricular activities
32% 369 (b) Parking
18% 208 (c) Course offerings
7% 76 (d) Communications
6% 72 (e) Grading
RESPONSES CONTINUED #40
175-U

40. (a) Accessibility of faculty
7% 99 (b) Advisement
14% 199 (c) Accessibility of administrators
2% 28 (d) Other (Please specify here: _____)
8% 88
558-U

41. How do you spend most non-class time during schooldays?

26%	248	(a) Studying
42%	398	(b) Working
9%	81	(c) Non-academic activities on campus
17%	159	(d) Non-academic activities off campus
4%	42	(e) Other (Please specify here:)

12-U

42. What is your primary transportation problem?

14%	133	(a) Distance/time to commute
19%	178	(b) Expense of commuting
49%	463	(c) Parking at YSU
5%	51	(d) Traveling at night
7%	67	(e) Other (Please specify here:)

48-U

43. If buses were available at convenient times would you take advantage of such a service?

27%	257	(a) Yes
41%	386	(b) No
31%	291	(c) Maybe

6-U

44. Because of commuting, do you have trouble taking certain courses?

13%	119	(a) Frequently
41%	384	(b) Occasionally
45%	421	(c) Never

16-U

45. If your response to question 44 is either (a) or (b), why?

15%	89	(a) Transportation problems
45%	261	(b) Conflicting working hours
6%	34	(c) Getting advisement is difficult
25%	145	(d) Don't want to take night classes
8%	48	(e) Other (Please specify here:)

363-U

46. In which of the following areas is campus information hardest to get?

33%	308	(a) Academic information
10%	90	(b) Social events & meetings
21%	202	(c) Student services
33%	308	(d) No difficulty getting information
2%	19	(e) Other (Please specify here:)

13-U

47. Would you recommend YSU to your friends?

29%	269	(a) Definitely
46%	430	(b) Probably
16%	154	(c) Uncertain
7%	70	(d) Probably not
2%	16	(e) Definitely not

1-U

48. Would you be in favor of a specific hour being set aside (for example, 12 noon to 1:00 p.m. on Tuesdays and Thursdays) as a free hour when no classes would be held?

19%	175	(a) Yes
46%	432	(b) No
14%	134	(c) Not sure
21%	196	(d) Don't care

3-U

49. If such an hour was set aside, how would you use it?

22%	206	(a) Studying
8%	74	(b) Meetings (committees or organizations)
7%	64	(c) Go home
29%	272	(d) Recreation or entertainment
31%	293	(e) Don't know

31-U

50. When would you prefer extra-curricular activities be held?

2%	22	(a) Mornings
12%	115	(b) Afternoons
25%	236	(c) Evenings
36%	335	(d) Afternoons & evenings
24%	230	(e) Don't care

2-U

51. What time would you prefer extra-curricular events in the afternoon to begin?

22%	204	(a) 1:00 p.m.
19%	179	(b) 2:00 p.m.
20%	187	(c) 3:00 p.m.
12%	114	(d) 4:00 p.m.
21%	194	(e) 5:00 p.m.

62-U

52. What time would you prefer evening events to begin?

14%	136	(a) 6:00 p.m.
31%	287	(b) 7:00 p.m.
32%	303	(c) 8:00 p.m.
10%	98	(d) 9:00 p.m.
6%	60	(e) 10:00 p.m.

56-U

53. Would you attend an activity of interest to you if it were held on a Saturday?

54%	505	(a) Yes
8%	77	(b) No
26%	249	(c) Depends on work schedule
11%	103	(d) Don't know

6-U

54. Do you feel YSU is interested in you as an individual?

4%	35	(a) Yes, always
35%	328	(b) Yes, usually
43%	405	(c) No
19%	170	(d) Don't know

2-U

Following is a list of activities and programs available at YSU or which could be made available. Please indicate your interest in these areas by marking "(a)" if the activity is OF NO INTEREST, "(b)" if the activity is OF SOME INTEREST, and "(c)" if the activity is OF MAJOR INTEREST.

PROGRAM/ACTIVITY	(a) OF NO INTEREST	(b) OF SOME INTEREST	(c) OF MAJOR INTEREST
55. Intramurals	424 (45%)	360 (38%)	151 (16%)
56. Varsity Athletics (as a spectator)	241 (26%)	509 (54%)	190 (20%)
57. Varsity Athletics (as a participant)	655 (70%)	191 (20%)	92 (10%)
58. Social Activities	203 (22%)	518 (55%)	217 (23%)
59. Student Government	462 (49%)	397 (42%)	79 (8%)
60. Fraternities/Sororities	660 (70%)	198 (21%)	82 (9%)
61. Cultural Programs	298 (32%)	432 (46%)	209 (22%)
62. Outdoor Recreation	174 (18%)	469 (50%)	295 (31%)
63. Films	120 (13%)	519 (55%)	300 (32%)
64. Academically-related Clubs	329 (35%)	456 (49%)	153 (16%)
65. Student Publications	273 (29%)	517 (55%)	148 (16%)
66. Volunteer Service	398 (42%)	444 (47%)	96 (10%)
67. Activities for Married Students	648 (69%)	179 (19%)	113 (12%)
68. Activities for Older Students	585 (62%)	226 (24%)	129 (14%)
69. Activities for Minority Students	698 (74%)	164 (17%)	78 (8%)
70. Concerts/Musical Performances	102 (11%)	362 (38%)	476 (51%)
71. Interest Clubs (Non-academic)	281 (30%)	468 (50%)	191 (20%)
72. The Pub in Kilcawley Center	364 (39%)	407 (43%)	169 (18%)
73. Recreation Room in Kilcawley Center	301 (32%)	475 (51%)	164 (17%)
74. Music-listening Room in the Center	264 (28%)	473 (50%)	203 (22%)
75. Television programs in Kilcawley	407 (43%)	415 (44%)	117 (12%)
76. Swimming	188 (20%)	464 (49%)	288 (31%)
77. Beeghly Center Facilities	155 (16%)	440 (47%)	344 (36%)

Following is a list of services available to YSU students. Please indicate whether you have heard of, or used, each service listed by marking the appropriate space on the answer sheet.

SERVICE	(a) NEVER HEARD OF IT	(b) HEARD OF BUT NEVER USED IT	(c) USED ONE OR TWO TIMES	(d) USED FREQ.	(e) USED REGULARLY
78. Career Planning	237 (25%)	578 (61%)	92 (10%)	16 (2%)	8 (1%)
79. Counseling	47 (5%)	577 (61%)	230 (24%)	45 (5%)	31 (3%)
80. Financial Aids	34 (4%)	481 (51%)	185 (20%)	83 (9%)	146 (16%)
81. Free Clinic	182 (19%)	639 (68%)	93 (10%)	12 (1%)	5 (0%)
82. Health Service	274 (29%)	529 (56%)	109 (12%)	14 (1%)	5 (0%)
83. Handicapped Services	479 (51%)	439 (47%)	11 (1%)	1 (0%)	1 (0%)
84. International Students	397 (42%)	509 (54%)	8 (1%)	10 (1%)	7 (1%)
85. Off-Campus Housing	188 (20%)	678 (72%)	40 (4%)	7 (1%)	18 (2%)
86. Job Placement	118 (12%)	643 (68%)	127 (14%)	29 (3%)	14 (1%)
87. Testing	294 (31%)	475 (51%)	139 (15%)	10 (1%)	10 (1%)
88. Tutoring	94 (10%)	706 (75%)	109 (12%)	16 (2%)	6 (1%)
89. Campus Ministry	473 (50%)	425 (45%)	23 (2%)	7 (1%)	3 (0%)
90. Escort Service	223 (24%)	681 (72%)	16 (2%)	4 (0%)	5 (0%)
91. Leadership Workshops	687 (73%)	211 (22%)	28 (3%)	3 (0%)	1 (0%)
92. Student Development	492 (52%)	383 (41%)	43 (4%)	5 (0%)	7 (1%)
93. Student Employment (On-Campus)	104 (11%)	693 (74%)	77 (8%)	15 (2%)	40 (4%)
94. Student Employment (Off-Campus)	294 (31%)	549 (58%)	60 (6%)	10 (1%)	16 (2%)
95. Discount Tickets to Cultural Events	409 (44%)	283 (30%)	181 (19%)	44 (5%)	12 (1%)
96. Student Activities Office	265 (28%)	491 (52%)	130 (14%)	25 (3%)	12 (1%)
97. Communication Seminars	659 (70%)	226 (24%)	25 (3%)	2 (0%)	0

IF YOU WISH TO BE INCLUDED IN THE DRAWING, PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR NAME AND PHONE NUMBER BELOW.

Name _____

Phone Number _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE

APPENDIX B: THE FOLLOW-UP INSTRUMENT

FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

Name of respondent_____Date_____

Hello, my name is_____and I'm conducting a brief telephone survey for the Student Affairs Department. Would you mind taking a few minutes to answer a couple of questions?

If YES, proceed with questionnaire
If NO, ask why and specify here:_____

_____

1. Did you receive a copy of the Student Opinion Survey?
   _____YES
   _____NO

2. Did you return the completed survey?
   _____YES (Thank you!)
   _____NO

3. If YES to Question 2, how important was the possibility of winning a calculator in your decision to complete and return the survey?
   _____Very Important
   _____Important
   _____Not very important
   _____Not at all important

4. If NO to Question 2, why didn't you return the survey?

   _____Too long
   _____Not interested in topics covered
   _____Not interested in changing the university
   _____Don't think anything would be done with results
   _____Didn't think you would be interested in my comments
   _____Forgot
   _____Other (please specify):_____

   _____

   _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.

APPENDIX C:
CHI-SQUARE SIGNIFICANCE AND ASYMMETRIC LAMBDAS
BY DEPENDENT VARIABLES

VARIABLE 1 DEPENDENT

Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda	Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda
12	.0066	.00480	55	.3775	.0
13	.0006	.00960	56	.4602	.0
14	.0004	.00480	57	.0008	.00160
15	.2477	.0	58	.3624	.00320
16	.0034	.00480	59	.0153	.00800
17	.2536	.0	60	.0842	.00320
18	.6688	.00160	61	.0356	.0
19	.3743	.0	62	.1147	.00160
20	.0505	.0	63	.0010	.00160
21	.2101	.0	64	.0064	.03040
22	.1099	.00160	65	.0013	.00480
23	.8764	.0	66	.2447	.0
24	.0091	.00320	67	.6882	.0
25	.6223	.0	68	.2876	.0
26	.0132	.00320	69	.0000	.02560
27	.0998	.00480	70	.0010	.01120
28	.3164	.00320	71	.0649	.00480
29	.0222	.00480	72	.5050	.0
30	.0036	.01760	73	.0032	.00160
31	.1803	.01280	74	.0001	.00800
32	.0001	.0	75	.0995	.0
33	.2779	.00160	76	.0236	.0
34	.0530	.00640	77	.4166	.00320
35	.0000	.01760	78	.2703	.00640
36	.0028	.00480	79	.0956	.00320
37	.0004	.01120	80	.1197	.00320
38	.0080	.01600	81	.4635	.00160
39	.0101	.0	82	.0000	.02240
40	.3688	.0	83	.2215	.00160
41	.0133	.00480	84	.0101	.01440
42	.0172	.01120	85	.5828	.00960
43	.3722	.00480	86	.0201	.00640
44	.5075	.00800	87	.0001	.00480
45	.1112	.0	88	.0007	.00640
46	.0623	.0	89	.0327	.0
47	.0476	.00320	90	.0051	.01280
48	.0000	.00320	91	.6310	.00320
49	.1015	.0	92	.0239	.00960
50	.0000	.00480	93	.6899	.0
51	.0027	.00160	94	.0522	.01600
52	.0014	.00800	95	.2897	.00320
53	.0303	.00160	96	.0125	.01440
54	.0247	.00160	97	.9433	.0

VARIABLE 2 DEPENDENT

Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda	Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda
12	.0	.00817	55	.0610	.0
13	.0	.04087	56	.0004	.01090
14	.0	.0	57	.0	.0
15	.0744	.0	58	.0	.03815
16	.0082	.0	59	.0	.05722
17	.0000	.0	60	.0	.03815
18	.1534	.0	61	.0	.01635
19	.0000	.0	62	.0	.00817
20	.0	.0	63	.0	.01090
21	.0000	.0	64	.0	.04360
22	.0	.03270	65	.0000	.01635
23	.0001	.0	66	.2138	.0
24	.0000	.0	67	.0000	.00272
25	.0542	.0	68	.0000	.01362
26	.0098	.0	69	.0	.05995
27	.0037	.0	70	.0	.11717
28	.3491	.00272	71	.0	.05722
29	.1012	.0	72	.0000	.00272
30	.0	.02997	73	.0000	.00272
31	.7130	.0	74	.0	.05450
32	.0	.0	75	.0050	.0
33	.0	.0	76	.0147	.0
34	.0000	.01090	77	.0000	.02997
35	.0	.0	78	.9107	.0
36	.0	.02180	79	.4238	.0
37	.0	.00272	80	.0	.03815
38	.0	.04087	81	.0000	.01090
39	.0000	.0	82	.0	.03542
40	.0	.0	83	.0000	.03270
41	.0000	.0	84	.0	.01635
42	.0000	.0	85	.0	.0
43	.0000	.01362	86	.0	.01090
44	.0024	.0	87	.0	.08174
45	.0314	.0	88	.0	.05177
46	.0000	.0	89	.0	.02997
47	.0000	.0	90	.0	.07357
48	.0	.13896	91	.0	.02452
49	.0	.0	92	.0	.02997
50	.0	.13896	93	.0000	.0
51	.4937	.0	94	.0000	.0
52	.0	.02180	95	.0019	.0
53	.0000	.01362	96	.0	.01362
54	.0	.05450	97	.0000	.01635

VARIABLE 3 DEPENDENT

Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda	Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda
12	.0	.04663	55	.0022	.0
13	.0000	.0	56	.2491	.0
14	.0	.01209	57	.0000	.00345
15	.0016	.0	58	.0007	.00345
16	.1864	.00345	59	.0097	.0
17	.0000	.0	60	.0000	.00518
18	.0002	.02073	61	.0000	.0
19	.0088	.0	62	.2288	.0
20	.0000	.0	63	.0013	.0
21	.0368	.00173	64	.1073	.0
22	.0002	.00173	65	.0109	.00345
23	.0347	.00173	66	.5616	.0
24	.0000	.00173	67	.0218	.0
25	.0151	.0	68	.0000	.0
26	.1652	.0	69	.0000	.0
27	.0000	.01727	70	.0000	.0
28	.6265	.0	71	.0000	.00173
29	.0762	.0	72	.0075	.00173
30	.1267	.0	73	.0000	.0
31	.0012	.0	74	.0000	.00345
32	.0000	.00173	75	.0000	.0
33	.0035	.0	76	.5531	.0
34	.0237	.00345	77	.0013	.0
35	.0012	.0	78	.0011	.00173
36	.0009	.0	79	.0074	.00864
37	.0000	.00518	80	.0088	.0
38	.0000	.0	81	.0021	.0
39	.0006	.0	82	.0000	.00691
40	.0005	.00518	83	.1883	.0
41	.0000	.00173	84	.0082	.0
42	.0001	.0	85	.0073	.00518
43	.0014	.0	86	.0000	.01209
44	.7170	.0	87	.0000	.0
45	.0033	.00173	88	.0000	.0
46	.0048	.0	89	.0003	.0
47	.0000	.02591	90	.0	.00345
48	.0	.00345	91	.0182	.00173
49	.0000	.00691	92	.0000	.0
50	.0000	.0	93	.0044	.01727
51	.0001	.0	94	.0016	.01036
52	.0001	.0	95	.0045	.00518
53	.0015	.00173	96	.0220	.00345
54	.0000	.01209	97	.2857	.0

VARIABLE 4 DEPENDENT

Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda	Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda
12	.0	.05420	55	.0000	.0
13	.0	.40108	56	.0000	.02168
14	.0	.11111	57	.0	.0
15	.0000	.01897	58	.0	.03252
16	.0035	.00271	59	.0469	.00369
17	.0	.02439	60	.0095	.0
18	.0000	.0	61	.0179	.0
19	.0	.14634	62	.0000	.0
20	.0	.0	63	.0001	.0
21	.0000	.0	64	.5945	.0
22	.0	.0	65	.0000	.0
23	.1514	.0	66	.1866	.0
24	.0	.06775	67	.0	.18819
25	.0000	.0	68	.0	.0
26	.0366	.0	69	.0000	.00369
27	.0000	.00813	70	.0000	.0
28	.0007	.01626	71	.0000	.0
29	.0492	.0	72	.0000	.0
30	.0000	.04065	73	.0000	.0
31	.0000	.0	74	.0000	.0
32	.0000	.0	75	.0000	.0
33	.0	.03252	76	.0023	.0
34	.0	.02981	77	.0001	.0
35	.0	.0	78	.4480	.0
36	.0	.03252	79	.0363	.0
37	.0	.02439	80	.1006	.0
38	.0	.10298	81	.0000	.0
39	.0000	.0	82	.2110	.0
40	.0	.0	83	.1386	.0
41	.0000	.0	84	1.0000	.0
42	.0000	.0	85	.5242	.0
43	.0000	.01355	86	.4581	.0
44	.0000	.00271	87	.0001	.0
45	.0111	.0	88	.0925	.0
46	.0000	.0	89	.6276	.0
47	.0	.0	90	.0	.0
48	.0	.18157	91	.4612	.00369
49	.0	.0	92	.8687	.0
50	.0	.18428	93	.0001	.0
51	.2639	.0	94	.5994	.0
52	.0	.07317	95	.3633	.0
53	.0000	.01626	96	.0080	.0
54	.0	.08672	97	.8981	.0

VARIABLE 5 DEPENDENT

Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda	Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda
12	.0554	.08387	55	.0000	.18925
13	.0754	.04731	56	.0684	.05806
14	.6305	.04731	57	.0001	.12473
15	.5504	.03871	58	.3598	.04301
16	.6052	.03871	59	.9306	.00215
17	.0710	.04731	60	.4717	.02151
18	.0854	.10323	61	.0000	.13333
19	.2807	.05161	62	.6445	.03656
20	.7287	.03441	63	.7296	.00860
21	.1084	.08817	64	.2008	.04516
22	.9152	.01935	65	.3468	.01505
23	.0001	.02581	66	.0103	.10538
24	.1586	.08817	67	.3343	.02366
25	.0470	.07097	68	.2679	.03656
26	.0	.46667	69	.7929	.02151
27	.3314	.05376	70	.0258	.01935
28	.6340	.03226	71	.3052	.02581
29	.1781	.08817	72	.0000	.17204
30	.7668	.05376	73	.0000	.13978
31	.6577	.00430	74	.0198	.07957
32	.3839	.06667	75	.6684	.02151
33	.7594	.03871	76	.8419	.01935
34	.8723	.02151	77	.0001	.13548
35	.0066	.00430	78	.6125	.05806
36	.4278	.03011	79	.2788	.07097
37	.0151	.08817	80	.2692	.06667
38	.0030	.06882	81	.0001	.03441
39	.0223	.07957	82	.8377	.01720
40	.3132	.04731	83	.9553	.00215
41	.1942	.07957	84	.8411	.02796
42	.3578	.04086	85	.1557	.05376
43	.2978	.05806	86	.2105	.05376
44	.2674	.06022	87	.8038	.00430
45	.1759	.07312	88	.7811	.04301
46	.2575	.04516	89	.2750	.04086
47	.7353	.01720	90	.9544	.01505
48	.8971	.00860	91	.8326	.01290
49	.1245	.06452	92	.3470	.03871
50	.0797	.02796	93	.8012	.01505
51	.2073	.05376	94	.5556	.01935
52	.0187	.09032	95	.1674	.05376
53	.1623	.01720	96	.9826	.01505
54	.6647	.00645	97	.6666	.01075

VARIABLE 6 DEPENDENT

Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda	Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda
12	.0	.16369	55	.0000	.0
13	.0	.30655	56	.0162	.0
14	.0	.17857	57	.0000	.0
15	.0	.08631	58	.0	.06250
16	.5438	.00298	59	.0036	.00298
17	.0	.02083	60	.0000	.0
18	.0000	.0	61	.0000	.0
19	.0	.13393	62	.0000	.0
20	.5026	.0	63	.0004	.0
21	.0057	.0	64	.2482	.0
22	.0000	.0	65	.0164	.0
23	.0033	.00595	66	.0406	.0
24	.0	.13393	67	.0000	.02083
25	.0000	.0	68	.0	.11310
26	.0338	.0	69	.3772	.0
27	.0000	.0	70	.0000	.00595
28	.0	.00298	71	.0000	.0
29	.0154	.0	72	.0	.0
30	.7696	.0	73	.0	.0
31	.0000	.0	74	.0000	.0
32	.0002	.00595	75	.0000	.0
33	.5856	.00298	76	.0004	.0
34	.1291	.0	77	.0000	.01786
35	.6102	.0	78	.7131	.0
36	.0421	.0	79	.0195	.0
37	.0001	.0	80	.0015	.01190
38	.0000	.0	81	.0000	.01786
39	.5895	.0	82	.4831	.0
40	.2911	.0	83	.3981	.00298
41	.0000	.0	84	.1391	.00298
42	.0619	.0	85	.0246	.0
43	.0255	.0	86	.9935	.0
44	.1288	.00298	87	.2396	.0
45	.0059	.0	88	.0000	.0
46	.0156	.0	89	.0060	.0
47	.0000	.0	90	.0001	.0
48	.0	.00274	91	.5036	.00298
49	.0	.0	92	.0098	.0
50	.0	.0	93	.0571	.0
51	.0000	.0	94	.6408	.0
52	.0335	.0	95	.0910	.0
53	.3439	.0	96	.1607	.0
54	.0	.00595	97	.3444	.0

VARIABLE 7 DEPENDENT

Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda	Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda
12	.5831	.0	55	.2605	.0
13	.0407	.0	56	.0869	.0
14	.0086	.0	57	.0134	.0
15	.0203	.0	58	.3373	.01010
16	.5759	.0	59	.1503	.0
17	.1140	.0	60	.0001	.0
18	.9965	.0	61	.0000	.0
19	.0087	.0	62	.2107	.0
20	.2656	.0	63	.0168	.0
21	.3118	.0	64	.0000	.01010
22	.7193	.0	65	.5046	.0
23	.8284	.0	66	.0314	.0
24	.0005	.0	67	.1256	.0
25	.1376	.0	68	.0004	.0
26	.6451	.0	69	.0	.08081
27	.6806	.0	70	.0045	.0
28	.0787	.0	71	.3768	.0
29	.0010	.0	72	.3108	.0
30	.0154	.0	73	.4036	.0
31	.0982	.0	74	.0972	.0
32	.0000	.0	75	.0228	.0
33	.0298	.0	76	.3012	.0
34	.1748	.0	77	.0100	.02020
35	.3506	.0	78	.1935	.0
36	.1483	.0	79	.0001	.0
37	.5275	.0	80	.00012	.0
38	.0000	.0	81	.0000	.01010
39	.0188	.0	82	.0000	.0
40	.4350	.0	83	.1929	.01010
41	.1974	.0	84	.0	.01010
42	.5259	.0	85	.0098	.0
43	.0000	.0	86	.0	.16667
44	.6732	.0	87	.0	.36970
45	.0228	.0	88	.0	.23636
46	.4746	.0	89	.0	.14242
47	.0213	.0	90	.0	.31515
48	.0000	.0	91	.5210	.0
49	.0031	.0	92	.0000	.0
50	.0000	.0	93	.1225	.0
51	.0747	.0	94	.1759	.0
52	.5630	.0	95	.7441	.0
53	.0194	.0	96	.0153	.0
54	.7296	.0	97	.0826	.01010

VARIABLE 8 DEPENDENT

Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda	Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda
12	.0000	.07180	55	.0019	.0
13	.0	.10333	56	.0789	.0
14	.0	.22767	57	.1339	.0
15	.0000	.12434	58	.0001	.05079
16	.7192	.0	59	.0071	.00175
17	.0	.10683	60	.3831	.0
18	.0016	.01576	61	.1335	.0
19	.0	.06480	62	.0006	.02802
20	.0930	.00876	63	.0004	.04203
21	.0002	.0	64	.0001	.02627
22	.0000	.00525	65	.0026	.01751
23	.0004	.04553	66	.0016	.00175
24	.0000	.10333	67	.0000	.05954
25	.0060	.01751	68	.0000	.06130
26	.5554	.00175	69	.0272	.00701
27	.0000	.06130	70	.0000	.03327
28	.9234	.01051	71	.0000	.05954
29	.1562	.00876	72	.0000	.03503
30	.9737	.00350	73	.0067	.00175
31	.0000	.06655	74	.0000	.03503
32	.0000	.03327	75	.0286	.0
33	.2437	.02977	76	.0851	.00876
34	.0000	.03503	77	.0033	.03503
35	.1643	.02452	78	.9056	.0
36	.5809	.00876	79	.2607	.01226
37	.2986	.00350	80	.0000	.02802
38	.0000	.0	81	.6492	.00186
39	.6897	.0	82	.3294	.00701
40	.0011	.0	83	.7106	.00525
41	.0	.14886	84	.0062	.00701
42	.0000	.01576	85	.7516	.0
43	.0000	.0	86	.5233	.0
44	.1909	.00175	87	.0890	.00175
45	.0	.05779	88	.0009	.03678
46	.7863	.0	89	.3086	.01051
47	.2886	.0	90	.0007	.05604
48	.0013	.05954	91	.8932	.00350
49	.0000	.02102	92	.3840	.00350
50	.0000	.04028	93	.0000	.03503
51	.0	.11909	94	.0952	.0
52	.1963	.00175	95	.1303	.0
53	.0	.03327	96	.6447	.0
54	.2005	.00175	97	.3196	.00701

VARIABLE 9 DEPENDENT

Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda	Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda
12	.0000	.08128	55	.0000	.0
13	.0	.34975	56	.0297	.0
14	.0	.17241	57	.0002	.0
15	.0	.04680	58	.0000	.05665
16	.8652	.00246	59	.0029	.00246
17	.0000	.04187	60	.0000	.0
18	.0	.0	61	.0000	.0
19	.0	.20690	62	.0000	.03202
20	.3534	.0	63	.0000	.01478
21	.0256	.0	64	.7456	.0
22	.0000	.0	65	.0000	.0
23	.0151	.00985	66	.0323	.0
24	.0	.13300	67	.0	.21182
25	.0000	.0	68	.0	.09360
26	.3797	.00246	69	.0652	.0
27	.0000	.00739	70	.0000	.0
28	.0725	.0	71	.0000	.02709
29	.0001	.0	72	.0000	.0
30	.1002	.0	73	.0000	.02217
31	.0659	.0	74	.0000	.02463
32	.0956	.0	75	.0000	.0
33	.1094	.00231	76	.0167	.0
34	.0000	.0	77	.0000	.01478
35	.8571	.0	78	.0269	.0
36	.0000	.0	79	.0060	.02463
37	.0	.0	80	.0410	.01232
38	.0	.04433	81	.0	.02956
39	.0445	.0	82	.0000	.00246
40	.4700	.0	83	.4941	.0
41	.0000	.0	84	.0012	.00985
42	.0	.0	85	.0	.01478
43	.1827	.00246	86	.0560	.0
44	.0	.01478	87	.1010	.0
45	.0452	.0	88	.0091	.01232
46	.0106	.0	89	.0776	.0
47	.0000	.0	90	.0005	.0
48	.0079	.0	91	.0114	.00246
49	.0000	.02956	92	.6215	.0
50	.0000	.02709	93	.0000	.02463
51	.0000	.0	94	.0016	.0
52	.0037	.0	95	.3456	.0
53	.0042	.0	96	.0009	.0
54	.7009	.00246	97	.0090	.00246

VARIABLE 10 DEPENDENT

Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda	Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda
12	.0506	.0	55	.0372	.0
13	.1344	.0	56	.3365	.0
14	.0000	.00191	57	.0009	.00191
15	.0000	.01145	58	.0138	.00382
16	.0000	.0	59	.0593	.00191
17	.0023	.00191	60	.0152	.0
18	.0000	.0	61	.0178	.0
19	.0000	.00573	62	.0488	.0
20	.2781	.0	63	.0016	.0
21	.1385	.0	64	.5135	.00382
22	.5269	.00191	65	.0125	.0
23	.0122	.00382	66	.0056	.00382
24	.2391	.0	67	.7881	.0
25	.0047	.0	68	.4648	.0
26	.1474	.00191	69	.0000	.02290
27	.0342	.0	70	.0874	.0
28	.7188	.0	71	.0344	.0
29	.9069	.0	72	.1750	.0
30	.0	.00191	73	.7094	.0
31	.0033	.0	74	.0929	.0
32	.2796	.0	75	.0708	.0
33	.4129	.0	76	.8857	.0
34	.0111	.0	77	.0	.00191
35	.9681	.0	78	.0008	.00191
36	.1804	.0	79	.0945	.0
37	.1218	.0	80	.0001	.0
38	.0	.12786	81	.0001	.00573
39	.1267	.0	82	.0000	.01145
40	.6988	.0	83	.6332	.00573
41	.0338	.0	84	.0000	.00763
42	.0	.02481	85	.0000	.02481
43	.0030	.00191	86	.0028	.0
44	.0000	.0157	87	.0418	.0
45	.3016	.0	88	.0003	.0
46	.0346	.0	89	.0000	.00382
47	.0050	.0	90	.0000	.00191
48	.6020	.0	91	.2860	.0
49	.0128	.0	92	.0000	.0
50	.0951	.0	93	.0003	.0
51	.3787	.0	94	.0164	.0
52	.0144	.0	95	.0697	.0
53	.0000	.00191	96	.0007	.0
54	.6522	.00191	97	.0000	.0

VARIABLE 11 DEPENDENT

Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda	Independent Variable No.	X^2 Significance	Asymmetric Lambda
12	.0000	.03990	55	.0000	.0
13	.0	.03242	56	.0861	.0
14	.0	.13466	57	.0000	.00249
15	.0	.00249	58	.0000	.00249
16	.6820	.00249	59	.0003	.00249
17	.0	.02244	60	.1097	.0
18	.0000	.0	61	.0004	.0
19	.0000	.0	62	.0000	.0
20	.1512	.0	63	.0000	.0
21	.1987	.0	64	.0006	.0
22	.1829	.00249	65	.0008	.0
23	.0113	.00249	66	.1852	.0
24	.0	.06234	67	.0000	.0
25	.0041	.0	68	.0000	.0
26	.1034	.00249	69	.1106	.00249
27	.0000	.0	70	.0002	.0
28	.5377	.00249	71	.0000	.0
29	.4458	.0	72	.0000	.0
30	.0080	.00748	73	.0000	.0
31	.0000	.00748	74	.0000	.0
32	.0000	.00499	75	.0000	.0
33	.0105	.0	76	.0157	.0
34	.0024	.0	77	.0000	.00249
35	.6122	.0	78	.0000	.0
36	.4162	.0	79	.0185	.0
37	.0006	.0	80	.0	.01496
38	.0041	.0	81	.0000	.0
39	.0786	.0	82	.3362	.0
40	.9080	.0	83	.0000	.00499
41	.0	.0	84	.9900	.0
42	.0345	.0	85	.0028	.0
43	.0695	.0	86	.1384	.0
44	.6141	.0	87	.1635	.0
45	.0000	.0	88	.0000	.0
46	.0077	.0	89	.1290	.0
47	.0371	.0	90	.0000	.0
48	.0000	.00499	91	.0055	.00249
49	.0000	.0	92	.0016	.0
50	.0000	.00499	93	.0000	.0
51	.0000	.0	94	.0330	.0
52	.0211	.0	95	.6983	.0
53	.6939	.0	96	.0000	.0
54	.1003	.00499	97	.2698	.0